

Amdt. dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2005

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants canceled claims 12, 26, and 40 to overcome the Examiner's claim objections on page 3 of the Third Office Action.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 14-16, 18, 22-25, 28-30, 32, 36-39, and 42 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Adler ("Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL), Version 1.0, published on Oct. 18, 2000). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 15, and 29 concern processing a source document in a structured document format including elements providing source content to render, wherein the source content comprises code that is rasterized into output, and require: receiving the source document including source content in a presentation language; receiving a layout data structure separate from the source document, providing formatting properties specifying a layout and format of the content output, wherein the layout data structure does not include source content; processing the source document and the layout data structure to determine formatting properties, including page divisions, for the content in the source document; generating multiple page objects, wherein each page object includes the source content in the presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties for one page, wherein at least one page object has multiple content elements, and wherein the content elements include content to place on the pages; and transmitting the page objects to a rasterizer to transform into renderable information capable of being generated by an output device.

Applicants amended claims 1, 15, and 29 to require that at least one page object has multiple content elements, and wherein the content elements include content to place on the pages. These added requirements are disclosed on at least FIG. 3, blocks 110-130, and pages 10-11 of the Specification.

During the phone interview, the Examiner indicated that the added claim requirement would likely distinguish over the cited art. Applicants amended the claims as discussed to place the case in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the amended claims distinguish over the cited art for the following reasons.

The Examiner cited pgs. 20-21 and 25-27 of Adler as disclosing the claim requirement of generating the page objects. Applicants traverse with respect to the amended requirement of generating multiple page objects, wherein each page object includes the source content in the

Amdt. dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2005

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties for one page, wherein at least one page object has multiple content elements, and wherein the content elements include content to place on the pages.

The cited pgs. 20-21 of Adler discuss how formatting objects are generated from an XML document and an XSL stylesheet. Each formatting object represents a kind of formatting behavior, such as the formatting of a paragraph, color, space before, etc. Formatting consists of the generating of a tree of geometric areas positioned on a sequence of one or more pages. According to Adler, each geometric area has a position on the page, a specification of what to display, and borders.

Although the cited pg. 20 discusses geometric areas on pages, nowhere does the cited pg. 20 anywhere disclose that the formatting objects include source content in the presentation language used in the source document. Moreover, nowhere does the cited pg. 20 anywhere disclose generating page objects and that at least one page object has multiple content elements including content to place on the pages. Instead, the cited pg. 20 discusses how a tree defines geometric areas positioned on a sequence of one or more pages.

The cited pg. 21 discusses the steps in formatting to "objectify" the element and attribute tree obtained via an XSLT transformation by turning the elements in the tree into formatting object nodes, the attributes into property specifications, the characters replaced with fo:character nodes, etc. Nowhere does the cited pg. 21 disclose the claim requirements of generating multiple page objects, wherein each page object includes the source content in the presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties for one page, and that at least one page object has multiple content elements.

The cited pg. 25 discusses the goal of XSL to provide designers control over features. The cited pg. 27 discusses formatting objects that describe both the layout structure of a page or frame and the rules by which the XML source content is placed in the containers - formatting objects. The formatting object allows one to define independently filled regions for the body. Page sequences specify the order in which page masters will be used. The page sequence also specifies how styled content is to fill those pages.

Although the cited pg. 27 discusses how page sequences specify how styled content is used to fill pages, nowhere does the cited pg. 27 disclose generating page objects including

Amdt. dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2005

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

source content in the presentation language used in the source document and the determined formatting properties for one page. Further, nowhere does the cited pgs. 25-27 disclose the claim requirement that at least one page object has multiple content elements including content to place on the pages.

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the amended claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable over the cited art and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24-29, 33, 35, 36, and 38-42 are patentable over the cited Adler because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 30, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Certain of these dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 2, 16, and 30 depend from claims 1, 15, and 30 and further require that the source document includes statements in a first presentation language and transforming the source document and source content therein into a result document in a second presentation language, wherein the result document includes the source content and the formatting properties provided by the layout data structure, wherein the formatting properties indicate page divisions of the content, and wherein the multiple page objects are generated from the result document.

The Examiner cited pgs. 17-18, 20-21, and 25-27 as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pg. 4)

The cited pgs. 17-28 discusses how an XSL stylesheet processor accepts an XML and XSL document and produces presentation of that XML source content in a result tree and produces formatted results. As discussed, the cited pgs. 20-21 provides discussion on formatting objects and the cited pgs. 25-27 also discusses formatting objects and page sequences. Nowhere does the cited Adler anywhere disclose that page objects including source content in the first presentation language are generated from the result document that is in a second presentation language. Moreover, nowhere does the cited Adler disclose that at least one page object has multiple content elements as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 2, 16, and 31 provide additional grounds of patentability because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 19, 21, 21, 33, and 35 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Adler in view of Barry (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,165). Applicants traverse.

Amtd. dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2005

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

Claims 5, 7, 19, 21, 21, 33, and 35 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 29, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Applicants added claims 43-48.

Added claims 43, 45, and 47 depend from claims 1, 15, and 29 and further require that generating page objects comprises: adding at least one content element to one page object until the page object does not have available space for an additional content element; adding at least one additional content element to at least one additional page object until all content elements are included in page objects.

The limitations of the added claims are disclosed on at least FIG. 3, blocks 110-130, and pages 10-11 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that claims 43, 45, and 47 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 15, and 29, respectively, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Added claims 44, 46, and 48 depend from claims 43, 45, and 47, respectively, and further require that the page sequence elements include content elements and accessing page sequence elements according to an ordering of the page sequence elements, wherein the content elements within the accessed page sequence elements are added to page objects.

The limitations of the added claims are disclosed on at least FIG. 3, blocks 110-130, and pages 10-11 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that claims 44, 46, and 48 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 15, and 29, respectively, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base and intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-16, 18-25, 28-30, 32-39, and 42-48 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith

Amdt. dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2005

Serial No. 09/782,850
Docket No. BLD920000048US1
Firm No. 0036.0085

the fee for the one-month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: September 2, 2005

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984